

Spin-1 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation

A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath*

February 7, 2008

Abstract

This paper extends to Maxwell theory our earlier work, in which we studied the quantum amplitude (not just the probability) to have final data $(h_{ij}, \phi)_F$ for Einstein gravity and a massless scalar field, posed on a final space-like hypersurface Σ_F , given initial data $(h_{ij}, \phi)_I$ on an initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I . Here, h_{ij} ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$) denotes the asymptotically-flat intrinsic spatial metric on Σ_I or Σ_F ; both hypersurfaces are diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^3$. They are separated by a very large time-interval T , as measured at spatial infinity. The initial boundary data may be chosen (say) to be spherically-symmetric, corresponding to a nearly-spherical configuration prior to gravitational collapse. The final data may be chosen to register the accumulated spin-0 and spin-2 quantum radiation, following gravitational collapse, provided that both initial and final data have the same mass M , measured at spatial infinity. In order to make the quantum amplitude well-defined, Feynman's $+i\epsilon$ approach is taken. Here, this involves a rotation into the complex: $T \rightarrow |T|\exp(-i\theta)$, with $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. In this case, a complex solution of the *classical* boundary-value problem is expected to exist, whereas, for Lorentzian signature ($\theta = 0$), the classical boundary-value problem is badly posed. For a locally-supersymmetric theory, the quantum amplitude should be proportional to $\exp(iS_{\text{class}})$, apart from corrections which are very small when the frequencies in the boundary data are small compared to the Planck scale. Here, S_{class} is the action of the classical solution. The desired Lorentzian amplitude is then found by taking the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0_+$. A Maxwell field may be included additionally; it is natural to regard its magnetic field B_i as giving additional boundary data on Σ_I and Σ_F . By a process which parallels exactly our previous spin-0-amplitude calculation, one can obtain the quantum amplitude for photon data on Σ_F . The magnetic boundary conditions are related by supersymmetry to the natural spin-2 (gravitational-wave) boundary conditions, which involve fixing the magnetic part of the Weyl tensor.

*Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom

1 Introduction

Previous work on this project has been concerned with quantum amplitudes for scalar fields at late times, following a nearly-spherically-symmetric Einstein/massless-scalar collapse to a black hole [1-7]. For simplicity, we have assumed that, on an initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I at some early time, spherically-symmetric (Dirichlet) boundary data are specified for the gravitational and scalar fields. After an extremely large time-interval T , as measured at spatial infinity, a final space-like hypersurface Σ_F carries final Dirichlet data for gravity and the scalar field. Again for simplicity, we have so far considered the case in which the final gravitational data on Σ_F are also spherically-symmetric, whereas the final scalar data include a small non-spherical part $\phi^{(1)}$. The time-interval T should preferably be taken sufficiently large that the evaporation of the black hole is complete before time T .

The quantum amplitude is calculated by means of Feynman's $+i\epsilon$ approach [8]: one begins by rotating T into the complex: $T \rightarrow |T| \exp(-i\theta)$, where $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. Then the *classical* boundary-value problem for the linearised scalar perturbation of the background spherically-symmetric Einstein/scalar solution is expected to be well posed, having a classical Lorentzian action S_{class} . (For the Lorentzian-signature case with $\theta = 0$, the boundary-value problem is badly posed, being in effect a hyperbolic or wave-like boundary-value problem [9-11]). The Lorentzian quantum amplitude for the final scalar configuration $\phi^{(1)}$ is then found by applying the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0_+$ to the semi-classical amplitude, which is proportional to $\exp(iS_{\text{class}})$, for a locally-supersymmetric theory containing Einstein gravity and a massless scalar, as in [9,12], apart from loop corrections which should be negligible for boundary data involving frequencies below the Planck scale.

This procedure was carried out in detail in [5], for the case of a real scalar field. In the present paper, the analogous approach is applied to the (spin-1) Maxwell field. That is, the extra ingredient of a weak (linearised) Maxwell field is combined with a typical nearly-spherical Einstein/massless-scalar classical solution, as described above. In particular, we again study initial data on Σ_I which are spherically symmetric, containing only background gravitational and scalar components. On the final surface Σ_F , for simplicity we now take both the gravitational and scalar configurations to be exactly spherically symmetric, but include final data for a weak Maxwell field. The calculation leads in Sec.5 to an expression for the semi-classical amplitude, proportional to $\exp(iS_{\text{class}}^{EM})$, as a functional of the final Maxwell boundary data; here, S_{class}^{EM} denotes the Maxwell contribution to the classical action. The resulting Lorentzian quantum amplitude is Gaussian in form, for weak Maxwell fields – just as the amplitude of [5] for weak non-spherical final scalar data is Gaussian.

In Sec.2 we consider the Maxwell action and suitable boundary conditions. In Sec.3, we summarise the Regge-Wheeler formalism [13] for spin-1 (Maxwell) perturbations of spherically-symmetric black holes. Using this language, we treat the classical Maxwell field equations in Sec.4. The question of appropriate boundary conditions is resolved in Sec.5, and the classical Maxwell action S_{class}^{EM}

is presented as a functional of the final spin-1 boundary data. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the treatment then continues along the same lines as in [5] for spin-0 (massless-scalar) perturbations on the final hypersurface Σ_F .

It is found in Sec.5 that the appropriate boundary data, both for odd- and even-parity spin-1 perturbations, involve fixing the magnetic field on the boundary. In [14], which also treats the more complicated spin-2 (gravitational-wave) analogue of the present spin-1 calculation, the treatment again parallels that of the present paper, to arrive at a Gaussian expression for the quantum amplitude for weak gravitational-wave data on the final hypersurface Σ_F . In the spin-2 case, the natural boundary conditions for both odd- and even-parity perturbations turn out to involve fixing the magnetic part of the Weyl tensor [15-18]. It should not be surprising that a pattern emerges for the appropriate boundary conditions for different bosonic spins $s = 0, 1, 2$. (Had we taken a complex scalar field $\phi = \phi_1 + i\phi_2$ in [4-6], such as appears in locally-supersymmetric models [19-22], we should have found that, while Dirichlet conditions are appropriate for ϕ_1 , Neumann conditions are needed for ϕ_2 .) In Teukolsky's essentially spinor-based approach [23,24], which developed from around 1973, the classical field equations for spins $s = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}$ and 2, perturbed around a Kerr black-hole background, all fit into an s -dependent pattern. This question is clearly intimately connected with that of local supersymmetry; the Dirichlet/Neumann division for a complex scalar field arose in 1982 in the context of boundary conditions for gauged supergravity [20-22]. As part of a more unified description, the spin-1 magnetic boundary conditions will be described in the language of 2-component spinors [9,17,18] in Sec.6. The corresponding 2-spinor description of magnetic Weyl-tensor boundary conditions is also discussed briefly in Sec.7 of [14]. Our work on spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ amplitudes is described in [25]. The remaining fermionic case of spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ amplitudes is in preparation [26]; this is needed for a further understanding of local supersymmetry in the present context.

2 The Maxwell Equations

The Maxwell contribution to the total Lorentzian action S is

$$S^{EM} = - \frac{1}{16\pi} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d^4x \, (-g)^{\frac{1}{2}} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \quad , \quad (2.1)$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = F_{[\mu\nu]}$ is the Maxwell field strength, while $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the space-time metric, assumed here to have Lorentzian signature, with $g = \det(g_{\mu\nu}) < 0$. The resulting classical Maxwell field equations are

$$\nabla_\mu F^{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad . \quad (2.2)$$

The further condition that $F_{\mu\nu}$ be derivable from a vector potential A_μ , as

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu A_\nu - \nabla_\nu A_\mu = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu \quad , \quad (2.3)$$

may equivalently be written in the form of the dual field equations

$$\nabla_\mu (*F^{\mu\nu}) = 0 \quad , \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$*F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} F^{\alpha\beta} \quad (2.5)$$

is the dual field strength [17,18]. Here, $\eta_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}$ is the totally-antisymmetric tensor with components [27] (in Lorentzian signature)

$$\eta_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = (-g)^{1/2} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \quad , \quad (2.6)$$

where $g = \det(g_{\mu\nu})$ and $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}$ is the alternating symbol in 4 dimensions. (Note here that the Poincaré lemma [28] may be applied, since we are working within a manifold $\mathcal{M}$ which may be regarded as a slice of $\mathbb{R}^4$, with boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$ consisting of two $\mathbb{R}^3$ hypersurfaces.) The action (2.1) is invariant under Maxwell gauge transformations

$$A_\mu \rightarrow A_\mu + \partial_\mu \Lambda \quad , \quad (2.7)$$

in the interior, where $\Lambda(x)$ is a function of position.

As in [4-6] for scalar (spin-0) perturbations of spherical Einstein/massless-scalar gravitational collapse, and as in the treatment of spin-2 (graviton) perturbations, we shall need the classical action S_{class} , namely the action S evaluated at a classical solution of the appropriate (slightly complexified) boundary-value problem, in order to obtain the semi-classical quantum amplitude, proportional to $\exp(iS_{\text{class}})$, and hence by a limiting procedure to obtain the Lorentzian quantum amplitude. In the present (spin-1) Maxwell case, the classical action S_{class}^{EM} resides solely on the boundary $\partial\mathcal{M}$, which consists of the initial space-like hypersurface Σ_I and final hypersurface Σ_F . There will be no contribution from any large cylinder of radius $R_\infty \rightarrow \infty$, provided we impose the physically reasonable restriction that the potential A_μ die off faster than r^{-1} , and the field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ faster than r^{-2} , as $r \rightarrow \infty$. That is, we impose reasonable fall-off conditions at large r on field configurations, such that the action S should be finite. (Compare the usual fall-off conditions for instantons in Euclidean Yang-Mills theory [28-30].) For the above class of Maxwell field configurations, the boundary form of the classical Maxwell action is

$$S_{\text{class}}^{EM} = - \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F} d^3x \, h^{\frac{1}{2}} n_\mu A_\nu F^{\mu\nu} \quad . \quad (2.8)$$

Here $h_{ij} = g_{ij}$ ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$) gives the intrinsic Riemannian 3-metric on the boundary hypersurface Σ_I or Σ_F , and we write $h = \det(h_{ij}) > 0$. Further, n^μ denotes the (Lorentzian) unit timelike vector, normal to the space-like hypersurface Σ_I or Σ_F .

Given the $(3 + 1)$ split of the 4-metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ at each boundary, due to the ability to project vectors and tensors normally using n^μ and tangentially to Σ_I or Σ_F using the projector [27]

$$h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu \quad , \quad (2.9)$$

at the boundary, one can project the potential A_μ and field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ into 'normal' and 'spatial' parts on Σ_I and Σ_F . In particular, one defines the densitised electric field vector on the boundary:

$$\mathcal{E}^i = - h^{\frac{1}{2}} E^i \quad , \quad (2.10)$$

where

$$E^\nu = n_\mu F^{\mu\nu} \quad . \quad (2.11)$$

Further, in a Hamiltonian formulation [31], when one regards the spatial components A_i of the vector potential as 'coordinates', the canonical momentum π^i , automatically a vector density, is given by

$$\pi^i = - \frac{\mathcal{E}^i}{4\pi} \quad . \quad (2.12)$$

Note that the normal component $A_t = -\varphi$, where φ is the scalar potential, is gauge-dependent, but that φ does not need to be specified on the space-like boundaries Σ_I and Σ_F , and is indeed allowed to vary freely there and throughout the space-time. Its conjugate momentum therefore vanishes. In the gravitational case, analogous properties hold for the lapse function N and shift vector N^i [9,31].

As described in [31-33], it is most natural in specifying a classical boundary-value problem for the Maxwell field, with data given on the space-like boundaries Σ_I and Σ_F , together with a Lorentzian time-separation T , as measured at spatial infinity, to fix the spatial magnetic field components, described in densitised form by

$$\mathcal{B}^i = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{ijk} F_{jk} \quad , \quad (2.13)$$

on Σ_I and Σ_F . The $\mathcal{B}^i$ cannot be specified freely on the boundary, but only subject to the restriction

$$\partial_i \mathcal{B}^i = 0 \quad . \quad (2.14)$$

These components are gauge-invariant, and therefore physically measurable, in contrast to those of the spatially-projected vector potential A_i . We shall regard the space of such $\mathcal{B}^i(x)$, on Σ_I or Σ_F , as the 'coordinates' for Maxwell theory. From the space-time Maxwell equations (2.2), one also deduces the constraint

$$\partial_i \mathcal{E}^i = 0 \quad . \quad (2.15)$$

3 The Regge-Wheeler formalism

In 1957, Regge and Wheeler [13] developed the formalism for treating both spin-1 and spin-2 classical perturbations of the Schwarzschild solution and of other spherically-symmetric solutions, corresponding to Maxwell and gravitational (graviton) perturbations. Here, in the Regge-Wheeler (RW) formalism,

for Maxwell theory we decompose the real linearised field strength $F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ and linearised vector potential $A_\mu^{(1)}$ into tensor and vector spherical harmonics, respectively [34,35]. We are assuming that the background (unperturbed) classical solution consists, as in [4-7], of a spherically-symmetric gravitational and massless-scalar field $(\gamma_{\mu\nu}, \Phi)$, with no background Maxwell field: $A_\mu^{(0)} = 0$, $F_{\mu\nu}^{(0)} = 0$.

For each spin $s = 0, 1, 2$, the corresponding perturbation modes split into those with even parity and those with odd parity. Under the parity inversion: $\theta \rightarrow (\pi - \theta)$, $\phi \rightarrow (\pi + \phi)$, we define the even perturbations as those with parity $\pi = (-1)^\ell$, while the odd perturbations have parity $\pi = (-1)^{\ell+1}$. For Maxwell theory ($s = 1$), the $\ell = 0$ mode corresponds to a static perturbation, in which a small amount of electric charge is added to the black hole; in particular, a Schwarzschild solution will be 'displaced' infinitesimally along the family of Reissner-Nordström solutions. For radiative modes with $\ell = 1$ (dipole) and higher, we set

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(x) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-\ell}^{\ell} \left[\left(F_{\mu\nu}^{(o)} \right)_{\ell m} + \left(F_{\mu\nu}^{(e)} \right)_{\ell m} \right] , \quad (3.1)$$

$$A_\mu^{(1)}(x) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-\ell}^{\ell} \left[\left(A_\mu^{(o)} \right)_{\ell m} + \left(A_\mu^{(e)} \right)_{\ell m} \right] . \quad (3.2)$$

On substituting this decomposition into the boundary expression (2.7) for the classical Maxwell action S_{class}^{EM} , we find

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{class}}^{EM} = & -\frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m \ell' m'} \int d\Omega \int_0^{R_\infty} dr r^2 e^{(a-b)/2} \gamma^{ij} \left(A_j^{(o)} \right)_{\ell m} \left(F_{ti}^{(o)} \right)_{\ell' m'}^* \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F} \\ & -\frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m \ell' m'} \int d\Omega \int_0^{R_\infty} dr r^2 e^{(a-b)/2} \gamma^{ij} \left(A_j^{(e)} \right)_{\ell m} \left(F_{ti}^{(e)} \right)_{\ell' m'}^* \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where $\int d\Omega$ denotes integration over the sphere, with respect to the angular coordinates θ, ϕ , and the spherically-symmetric background metric is taken in the form [4-6]:

$$ds^2 = -e^{b(t,r)} dt^2 + e^{a(t,r)} dr^2 + r^2 (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) . \quad (3.4)$$

For later reference, we define $m(t, r)$ by

$$e^{-a} = 1 - \frac{2m(t, r)}{r} , \quad (3.5)$$

within the region of the space-time where the black hole is evaporating. Clearly, the odd and even contributions decouple.

For the subsequent detailed treatment of the angular harmonics involved, we follow Zerilli's decomposition [36] of $F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ and $A_\mu^{(1)}$. We set

$$F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}(x) = \sum_{\ell m} \left(F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)} \right)_{\ell m} , \quad (3.6)$$

$$\left(F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}\right)_{\ell m} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & f_1 & f_2 & f_3 \\ -f_1 & 0 & f_4 & f_5 \\ -f_2 & -f_4 & 0 & f_6 \\ -f_3 & -f_5 & -f_6 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.7)$$

For a given choice of (ℓ, m) , we take

$$f_1 = (\hat{F}_{tr}^{(e)})_{\ell m} Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) \quad , \quad (3.8)$$

$$f_2 = (\sin \theta)^{-1} (\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(o)})_{\ell m} (\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m}) + (\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} (\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m}) \quad , \quad (3.9)$$

$$f_3 = -(\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(o)})_{\ell m} (\sin \theta) (\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m}) + (\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} (\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m}) \quad , \quad (3.10)$$

$$f_4 = (\sin \theta)^{-1} (\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(o)})_{\ell m} (\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m}) + (\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} (\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m}) \quad , \quad (3.11)$$

$$f_5 = -(\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(o)})_{\ell m} (\sin \theta) (\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m}) + (\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} (\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m}) \quad , \quad (3.12)$$

$$f_6 = (\hat{F}_{\theta\phi}^{(o)})_{\ell m} (\sin \theta) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) \quad . \quad (3.13)$$

Here, the $Y_{\ell m}(\Omega)$ are scalar spherical harmonics [37], and a caret indicates that the quantity is a function of t and r only.

Again, following [13], for the vector potential, we set

$$\left(A_\mu^{(o)}\right)_{\ell m}(x) = \left(0, 0, \frac{a_{2\ell m}(t, r)(\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m})}{\ell(\ell+1)\sin \theta}, \frac{-a_{2\ell m}(t, r)(\sin \theta)(\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m})}{\ell(\ell+1)}\right) \quad (3.14)$$

$$\left(A_\mu^{(e)}\right)_{\ell m}(x) = \left(-a_{0\ell m}(t, r) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega), a_{1\ell m}(t, r) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega), 0, 0\right). \quad (3.15)$$

Eq.(3.3) can now be expanded out in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{class}}^{EM} = & -\frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m \ell' m'} \int d\Omega \int_0^{R_\infty} dr e^{(a-b)/2} \times \\ & \times \left[\left(A_\theta^{(o)}\right)_{\ell m} \left(F_{t\theta}^{(o)}\right)_{\ell' m'}^* + (\sin \theta)^{-2} \left(A_\phi^{(o)}\right)_{\ell m} \left(F_{t\phi}^{(o)}\right)_{\ell' m'}^* \right] \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F} \\ & - \frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m \ell' m'} \int d\Omega \int_0^{R_\infty} dr r^2 e^{(a-b)/2} \left(A_r^{(e)}\right)_{\ell m} \left(F_{t,r}^{(e)}\right)_{\ell' m'}^* \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Of course, the components of the field strength are given in terms of those of the vector potential by Eq.(2.3); for example, $F_{t\theta}^{(1)} = (\partial_t A_\theta^{(1)} - \partial_\theta A_t^{(1)})$. This gives the relations

$$\left(\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(o)}\right)_{\ell m} = \frac{(\partial_t a_{2\ell m})}{\ell(\ell+1)} \quad , \quad (3.17)$$

$$\left(\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(e)}\right)_{\ell m} = a_{0\ell m} \quad , \quad (3.18)$$

$$\left(\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(o)}\right)_{\ell m} = \frac{(\partial_r a_{2\ell m})}{\ell(\ell+1)} \quad , \quad (3.19)$$

$$\left(\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)}\right)_{\ell m} = a_{1\ell m} \quad , \quad (3.20)$$

$$\left(\hat{F}_{tr}^{(e)}\right)_{\ell m} = (\partial_r a_{0\ell m}) - (\partial_t a_{1\ell m}) \quad , \quad (3.21)$$

$$\left(\hat{F}_{\theta\phi}^{(o)}\right)_{\ell m} = a_{2\ell m} \quad . \quad (3.22)$$

The action (3.16) then simplifies to give

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{class}}^{EM} = & -\frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m} \ell(\ell+1) \int_0^{R_\infty} dr \, e^{(a-b)/2} f_{\ell m}^{(o)} \left(\partial_t f_{\ell m}^{(o)*} \right) \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F} \\ & - \frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m} \int_0^{R_\infty} dr \, r^2 e^{-(a+b)/2} a_{1\ell m} \left((\partial_t a_{1\ell m}^*) - (\partial_r a_{0\ell m}^*) \right) \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

where

$$f_{\ell m}^{(o)} = \frac{a_{2\ell m}}{\ell(\ell+1)} \quad (3.24)$$

determines the odd-parity Maxwell tensor *via* Eqs.(3.17,19,22).

4 Field equations

The form of the classical action (3.22) can be further simplified by using the Maxwell field equations (2.2,4). This will lead finally to the form (4.14) below, in which S_{class}^{EM} is expressed explicitly in terms of boundary data, as needed in the subsequent calculation of the quantum amplitude (see [4-6] for the spin-0 analogue).

The linearised Maxwell equations can be written as

$$F^{(1)\mu\nu}_{;\nu} = (-\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \partial_\nu ((-\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2}} F^{(1)\mu\nu}) = 0 \quad . \quad (4.1)$$

The $\mu = t, r$ equations give

$$\partial_r (r^2 (\hat{F}_{tr}^{(e)})_{\ell m}) - \ell(\ell+1) e^a (\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} = 0 \quad , \quad (4.2)$$

$$e^a \partial_t (\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} - \partial_r (e^{-a} (\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m}) = 0 \quad , \quad (4.3)$$

$$\partial_r (e^{-a} (\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(o)})_{\ell m}) - e^a \partial_t (\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(o)})_{\ell m} - r^{-2} (\hat{F}_{\theta\phi}^{(o)})_{\ell m} = 0 \quad , \quad (4.4)$$

$$\partial_t (\hat{F}_{tr}^{(e)})_{\ell m} - r^{-2} e^{-a} \ell(\ell+1) (\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m} = 0 \quad . \quad (4.5)$$

The $\mu = \theta, \phi$ components give the same equations. Note that Eq.(4.2) is just the (source-free) constraint equation $\partial_i \mathcal{E}^{(1)i} = 0$ of Eq.(2.14).

The equations (3.17,19,22) together imply the decoupled wave equation for odd perturbations:

$$(\partial_{r^*})^2 a_{2\ell m} - (\partial_t)^2 a_{2\ell m} - V_{1\ell}(r) a_{2\ell m} = 0 \quad , \quad (4.6)$$

where

$$V_{1\ell}(r) = \frac{e^{-a} \ell(\ell+1)}{r^2} > 0 \quad (4.7)$$

is the (massless) spin-1 effective potential and where, as usual, we write $\partial_{r^*} = e^{-a} \partial_r$. As in [4-7], we assume that the adiabatic approximation is valid in a

neighbourhood of the initial and final surfaces, Σ_I and Σ_F . In that case, we can, as before, effectively work with the field equations on a Schwarzschild background, except that the Schwarzschild mass M_0 is replaced by a mass function $m(t, r)$, as in Eq.(3.5), which varies extremely slowly with respect both to time and to radius.

Equation (4.3) gives $\partial_t(\hat{F}_{t\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m}$ in terms of $(\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m}$, while Eq.(4.5) gives $\partial_t(\hat{F}_{tr}^{(e)})_{\ell m}$ in terms of $(\hat{F}_{r\theta}^{(e)})_{\ell m}$. Together, Eqs.(3.21, 4.3,5) imply that

$$(\partial_{r^*})^2 f_{\ell m}^{(e)} - (\partial_t)^2 f_{\ell m}^{(e)} - V_{1\ell} f_{\ell m}^{(e)} = 0 \quad , \quad (4.8)$$

where we define

$$f_{\ell m}^{(e)} = e^{-a} a_{1\ell m} \quad . \quad (4.9)$$

Thus, with a suitably defined variable $f_{\ell m}^{(e)}$, the even perturbations obey the same decoupled wave equation (4.6) as the odd perturbations.

Finally [38], we set

$$\psi_{\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r) = \frac{r^2}{\ell(\ell+1)} \left((\partial_t a_{1\ell m}) - (\partial_r a_{0\ell m}) \right) \quad , \quad (4.10)$$

which is clearly gauge-invariant. Now, $\psi_{\ell m}^{(e)}$ is simply related to the (even-parity) function $f_{\ell m}^{(e)}$ of the previous paragraph: Eqs.(4.3,8) imply that

$$(\partial_t \psi_{\ell m}^{(e)}) = - f_{\ell m}^{(e)} \quad . \quad (4.11)$$

Equations (4.9,10) can now be used to simplify the classical Lorentzian action (3.23). For ease of comparison with the (second-variation) classical spin-2 action, where the pattern is similar, we define

$$\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)} = a_{2\ell m}(t, r) \quad , \quad (4.12)$$

$$\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)} = \ell(\ell+1) \psi_{\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r) \quad . \quad (4.13)$$

Then, given weak-field Maxwell boundary data specified by the linearised magnetic-field mode components $\{B_{\ell m}^{(1)i}\}$ on each of the boundaries Σ_I and Σ_F , the corresponding classical Maxwell action is

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{class}}^{EM} \left[\left\{ B_{\ell m}^{(1)i} \right\} \right] \\ = \frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{\ell m} \frac{(\ell-1)!}{(\ell+1)!} \int_0^{R_\infty} dr e^a \left(\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)} (\partial_t \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)*}) - \psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)} (\partial_t \psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)*}) \right) \Big|_{\Sigma_I}^{\Sigma_F} . \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Of course, the limit $R_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ must be understood in Eq.(4.14).

Note further that, from Eqs.(3.18,4.2), one has

$$(\partial_{r^*} \psi_{\ell m}^{(e)}) = - a_{0\ell m} \quad , \quad (4.15)$$

whence $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}$ also obeys the same decoupled wave equation (4.6,8) as for $a_{2\ell m}$ and for $f_{\ell m}^{(e)}$, namely,

$$(\partial_{r*})^2 \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)} - (\partial_t)^2 \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)} - V_{1\ell} \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)} = 0 \quad . \quad (4.16)$$

The spin-1 radial equation (4.6,8,16) in a Schwarzschild background, both for odd- and even-parity Maxwell fields, was first given in 1962 by Wheeler [39].

This suggests a 'preferred route' for understanding the even-parity perturbations (which are more complicated than in the odd-parity case, which only involves the single function $a_{2\ell m}(t, r)$, obeying the decoupled field equation (4.6)): Given suitable boundary conditions, one first solves the linear decoupled wave equation in two variables t and r , namely, Eq.(4.16), for $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r)$. By differentiation, following Eqs.(4.13,15), one then finds $a_{0\ell m}(t, r)$. Then, by integrating Eq.(4.10), one obtains also $a_{1\ell m}(t, r)$, and hence, from Eq.(4.9), $f_{\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r)$. From Eqs.(3.17-22), one has all the non-zero components of the Maxwell field strength $F_{\mu\nu}$ in this even-parity case.

5 Boundary Conditions

Physically, our gauge-invariant odd- and even-parity variables $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$, $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}$ are effectively the radial components of the magnetic and electric field strengths, respectively:

$$B_{\ell m}^{(1)r}(x) = \frac{e^{-(a/2)}}{r^2} \psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}(t, r) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) \quad , \quad (5.1)$$

$$E_{\ell m}^{(1)r}(x) = - \frac{e^{-(a/2)}}{r^2} \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega) \quad , \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$B_{\ell m}^{(1)i} = ({}^{(3)}\gamma)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{B}_{\ell m}^{(1)i} \quad . \quad (5.3)$$

The remaining, transverse, magnetic field components are

$$B_{\ell m}^{(1)\theta}(x) = \frac{e^{-(a/2)}}{r^2(\sin\theta)} \left(a_{1\ell m}(t, r)(\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m}) + \frac{(\partial_r \psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)})}{\ell(\ell+1)}(\sin\theta)(\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m}) \right) \quad (5.4)$$

$$B_{\ell m}^{(1)\phi}(x) = \frac{e^{-(a/2)}}{r^2(\sin^2\theta)} \left(-a_{1\ell m}(t, r)(\sin\theta)(\partial_\theta Y_{\ell m}) + \frac{(\partial_r \psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)})}{\ell(\ell+1)}(\partial_\phi Y_{\ell m}) \right) \quad (5.5)$$

¶ The main aim of this paper is to calculate quantum amplitudes for weak spin-1 (Maxwell) perturbative data on the late-time final surface Σ_F , by evaluating the classical action S_{class}^{EM} and hence the semi-classical wave function $(\text{const.}) \times \exp(iS_{\text{class}}^{EM})$, as a functional of the spin-1 final boundary data. In Eq.(4.14), S_{class}^{EM} was expressed as an integral over the boundary, involving various perturbative quantities used in the description above of the dynamical perturbations. The present task is to determine 'optimal' or 'natural' boundary data, both for the odd-parity case and separately for the even-parity case,

such that (i.) the classical boundary-value problem can readily be solved, given these data, and (ii.) the classical Maxwell action S_{class}^{EM} can be (re-)expressed in terms of the appropriate boundary data. Under those conditions, we will then have a description of the spin-1 radiation, associated with gravitational collapse to a black hole, analogous to that for the spin-0 (massless-scalar) radiation, as developed in [4,5].

Following the discussion of Secs.2 and 4, the relevant field components to be fixed on Σ_I and Σ_F are, in the odd-parity case, $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$, as may be seen from Eq.(5.1). In the even-parity case, it is relevant to fix $a_{1\ell m}$, as may be seen from Eqs.(5.4,5). For the even case, from Eqs.(4.9,11), this is equivalent to specification of $(\partial_t \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)})$ on the boundary. Thus, we choose the boundary data to consist of $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$ in the odd-parity case, and $(\partial_t \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)})$ in the even-parity case. Hence, even though $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$ and $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}$ both obey the same dynamical field equations (4.6,12) and (4.16), the natural boundary conditions for them on $\Sigma_{I,F}$ are quite different – Dirichlet for the odd-parity case $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$, but Neumann in the even-parity case $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}$. This is reminiscent of the situation obtaining when spin-2 gravity is coupled to all lower spins, fermionic as well as bosonic; that is, to spins $s = \frac{3}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{2}$ and 0, especially in locally-supersymmetric models [19], such as models of gauged supergravity [20-22]. As we have found [14] for spin-2 (graviton) perturbed data on the final surface Σ_F , the natural boundary conditions are again contrasting, for odd-parity *vis-à-vis* even-parity modes. The remaining bosonic spin, namely $s = 0$ (scalar), demands the existence of one or more *complex* scalar fields (a multiplet) in the locally-supersymmetric models [19]. The treatment of the $s = 0$ case in [4-7] can be replicated in the case of a complex scalar field ϕ , except that the natural boundary conditions, consistent with the local supersymmetry, require $\text{Re}(\phi)$ to be fixed at a surface such as Σ_F (Dirichlet), whereas the normal derivative $\partial(\text{Im}(\phi))/\partial n$ must also be fixed (Neumann). Of course, this treatment extends to fermionic data ($s = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{2}$), as described in [25,26].

In the gravitational-collapse model, by analogy with the simplifying choice $\phi^{(1)}|_{\Sigma_I} = 0$ for the initial perturbative scalar-field data, taken in [4-7], we take (for the purposes of exposition) the simplest Maxwell initial data at Σ_I ($t = 0$). That is, we consider a negligibly weak magnetic field outside the ‘star’: the boundary conditions are

$$\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}(0, r) = 0 \quad , \quad (5.6)$$

$$(\partial_t \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)})(0, r) = 0 \quad . \quad (5.7)$$

Condition (5.6) is a Dirichlet condition on the initial odd-parity magnetic field – see Eqs.(5.1,4,5). Condition (5.7) implies that we have an initially static even-parity multipole [38].

We now follow the analysis of the spin-0 field, and separate the radial-and time-dependence. In neighbourhoods of Σ_I and Σ_F , where an adiabatic approximation is valid, we can ‘Fourier-expand’ the variables $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}(t, r)$ and $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r)$, subject to the initial conditions (5.6) and (5.7). By analogy with the scalar case

[5], let us write

$$\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}(t, r) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)} \psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r) \frac{\sin(kt)}{\sin(kT)} , \quad (5.8)$$

$$\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dk a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)} \psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r) \frac{\cos(kt)}{\sin(kT)} , \quad (5.9)$$

where the radial functions $\{\psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r)\}$ and $\{\psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r)\}$ are independent of m , given the spherical symmetry of the background space-time. Here, the position-independent quantities $\{a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)}\}$ and $\{a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)}\}$ are certain coefficients, with smooth dependence on the continuous variable k , which label the configuration of the electromagnetic field on the final surface Σ_F .

The radial functions $\{\psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r)\}$ and $\{\psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r)\}$ each obey a regularity condition at the 'centre of symmetry' $r = 0$ on the final surface Σ_F ; this requires that the corresponding (spatial) electric or magnetic field, defined *via* Eqs.(5.1-5), should be smooth in a neighbourhood of $r = 0$. As a consequence, the radial functions must be real:

$$\psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)*}(r) = \psi_{1,-k\ell}^{(o)}(r) , \quad \psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)*}(r) = \psi_{1,-k\ell}^{(e)}(r) . \quad (5.10)$$

For small r , the radial functions should further be asymptotically proportional to a spherical Bessel function [40]:

$$\psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r) \sim (\text{const.})_o r j_\ell(kr) , \quad (5.11)$$

$$\psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r) \sim (\text{const.})_e r j_\ell(kr) , \quad (5.12)$$

as $r \rightarrow 0_+$. Also, the reality of the radial electric and magnetic fields implies that

$$\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}(t, r) = (-1)^m \psi_{1\ell, -m}^{(o)*}(t, r) , \quad \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}(t, r) = (-1)^m \psi_{1\ell, -m}^{(e)*}(t, r) . \quad (5.13)$$

This in turn implies that

$$a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)} = (-1)^m a_{1, -k\ell, -m}^{(o)*} , \quad a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)} = (-1)^{m+1} a_{1, -k\ell, -m}^{(e)*} . \quad (5.14)$$

Since the potential (4.7), appearing in the (t, r) wave equation (4.6), tends sufficiently rapidly to zero as $r \rightarrow \infty$, where the space-time is almost Schwarzschild, one has asymptotic (large- r) behaviour of $\psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r)$ and $\psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r)$ which is analogous to that in the scalar case (see Eq.(3.3) of [5]):

$$\psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r) \sim \left(z_{k\ell}^{(o)} \exp(ik r_s^*) + z_{k\ell}^{(o)*} \exp(-ik r_s^*) \right) . \quad (5.15)$$

$$\psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r) \sim \left(z_{k\ell}^{(e)} \exp(ik r_s^*) + z_{k\ell}^{(e)*} \exp(-ik r_s^*) \right) . \quad (5.16)$$

Here $\{z_{k\ell}^{(o)}\}$ and $\{z_{k\ell}^{(e)}\}$ are complex coefficients, depending smoothly on the continuous variable k . Also, as usual, r_s^* is the Regge-Wheeler 'tortoise' coordinate

[13,31] for the Schwarzschild geometry. As in the scalar case [4,5], the inner product (normalisation) for the radial functions follows in the limit $R_\infty \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\int_0^{R_\infty} dr e^a \psi_{1k\ell}^{(o)}(r) \psi_{1k'\ell}^{(o)}(r) = 2\pi |z_{k\ell}^{(o)}|^2 \left(\delta(k, k') + \delta(k, -k') \right), \quad (5.17)$$

$$\int_0^{R_\infty} dr e^a \psi_{1k\ell}^{(e)}(r) \psi_{1k'\ell}^{(e)}(r) = 2\pi |z_{k\ell}^{(e)}|^2 \left(\delta(k, k') + \delta(k, -k') \right). \quad (5.18)$$

Finally, we are in a position to compute the classical Maxwell action S_{class}^{EM} as a functional of the spin-1 boundary data on the final surface Σ_F , whence (straightforwardly) the semi-classical wave function for complexified time-interval T , leading to the Lorentzian quantum amplitude or wave function. Our boundary conditions (5.6,7) above on the initial hypersurface Σ_I , at time $t = 0$, were designed so as to give zero contribution from Σ_I to the expression (4.14) for the classical action S_{class}^{EM} . The contribution to (4.14) from Σ_F is found, using Eqs.(5.8,9,17,18), to be

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{class}}^{EM} \left[\{a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)}, a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)}\} \right] \\ = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell m} \frac{(\ell-1)!}{(\ell+1)!} \int_0^\infty dk k \left[|z_{k\ell}^{(o)}|^2 \left(|a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)}|^2 + \text{Re} \left(a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)} a_{1,-k\ell m}^{(o)*} \right) \right) \right. \\ \left. + |z_{k\ell}^{(e)}|^2 \left(|a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)}|^2 + \text{Re} \left(a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)} a_{1,-k\ell m}^{(e)*} \right) \right) \right] \cot(kT) \Big|_{\Sigma_F}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

As promised, this does now express the classical action S_{class}^{EM} as an explicit functional of suitably-chosen boundary data, namely, $\{a_{1k\ell m}^{(o)}\}$ and $\{a_{1k\ell m}^{(e)}\}$.

6 Two-component spinor description of boundary data

As mentioned in the Introduction, a more unified view of the boundary conditions for perturbed data, as specified on the initial and final space-like hypersurfaces Σ_I and Σ_F , at least for the bosonic cases of spins $s = 0, 1$ and 2 , can be gained with the help of a description in terms of 2-component spinors [9,17,18]. In this Section, we simply consider the boundary condition for $s = 1$ in which the magnetic field is fixed on a (space-like) boundary. In Sec.7 of [14], we briefly describe spinorially the analogous spin-2 boundary condition, namely that the magnetic part of the Weyl tensor [15-18] is specified on the boundary.

Consider (in Lorentzian signature) a real Maxwell field strength tensor $F_{\mu\nu}$, which can be written locally in terms of a vector potential A_μ , as [Eq.(2.3)]

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu A_\nu - \nabla_\nu A_\mu = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu. \quad (6.1)$$

A space-time index μ is related to a pair of spinor indices AA' ($A = 0, 1$; $A' =$

$0', 1')$ through the (hermitian) spinor-valued 1-forms $e^{AA'}_{\mu}$, defined by [9,17,18]

$$e^{AA'}_{\mu} = e^a_{\mu} \sigma_a^{AA'} . \quad (6.2)$$

Here, e^a_{μ} denotes a (pseudo-) orthonormal basis of 1-forms ($a = 0, 1, 2, 3$), while $\sigma_a^{AA'}$ denotes the Infeld-van der Waerden translation symbols [9,17,18]. Knowledge of $F_{\mu\nu}$ at a point is equivalent to knowledge of

$$F_{AA'BB'} = F_{\mu\nu} e_{AA'}^{\mu} e_{BB'}^{\nu} , \quad (6.3)$$

at that point. Here, for a real Maxwell field in a real space-time of Lorentzian signature, $F_{AA'BB'}$ is hermitian. Further, the antisymmetry $F_{\mu\nu} = F_{[\mu\nu]}$ implies that the decomposition

$$F_{AA'BB'} = \epsilon_{AB} \tilde{\phi}_{A'B'} + \epsilon_{A'B'} \phi_{AB} , \quad (6.4)$$

holds, where ϵ_{AB} and $\epsilon_{A'B'}$ are the unprimed and primed alternating spinors [17,18], while

$$\phi_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} F_{AA'B}^{A'} = \phi_{BA} \quad (6.5)$$

is a symmetric spinor, and $\tilde{\phi}_{A'B'}$ is (in the real Lorentzian case) its symmetric hermitian-conjugate spinor. Eq.(6.4) gives the splitting of the Maxwell field strength into its self-dual and anti-self-dual parts. Knowledge of the 3 complex components of ϕ_{AB} at a point is equivalent to knowledge of the 6 real components of $F_{\mu\nu}$ at that point; also, the ϕ_{AB} are, in principle, physically measurable, just as the $F_{\mu\nu}$ are.

The dual field strength $*F_{\mu\nu}$ is defined [17,18], as in Eq.(2.5), to be

$$*F_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} F^{\alpha\beta} . \quad (6.6)$$

One finds that

$$F_{\mu\nu} + i *F_{\mu\nu} = 2 \phi_{AB} \epsilon_{A'B'} e^{AA'}_{\mu} e^{BB'}_{\nu} . \quad (6.7)$$

The vacuum Maxwell field equations (2.2,4) can be combined to give the equivalent version [17,18]

$$\nabla^{AA'} \phi_{AB} = 0 , \quad \nabla^{AA'} \tilde{\phi}_{A'B'} = 0 , \quad (6.8)$$

where $\nabla^{AA'} = e^{AA'\mu} \nabla_{\mu}$.

Here, we are interested in the decomposition of the Maxwell field strength with respect to a space-like bounding hypersurface and its associated unit (future-directed) normal vector n^{μ} . Define the normal spinor

$$n^{AA'} = n^{\mu} e^{AA'}_{\mu} . \quad (6.9)$$

Then the (purely spatial) electric and magnetic field vectors E_k and B_k on the boundary can be expressed through

$$E_k + i B_k = 2 \phi_{AB} n^A_{B'} e^{BB'}_k , \quad (6.10)$$

$$E_k - i B_k = 2 \tilde{\phi}_{A'B'} n_B^{A'} e^{BB'}_k . \quad (6.11)$$

In 4-vector language, the corresponding co-vector fields E_μ and B_μ are defined by

$$E_\mu = n^\nu F_{\nu\mu} , \quad B_\mu = n^\nu {}^*F_{\nu\mu} , \quad (6.12)$$

obeying

$$n^\mu E_\mu = 0 = n^\mu B_\mu . \quad (6.13)$$

Next, for $\epsilon = \pm 1$, define

$$\Psi_\epsilon^{AB} = 2 \epsilon n_{A'}^A n_{B'}^B \tilde{\phi}^{A'B'} + \phi^{AB} . \quad (6.14)$$

Here, Ψ_ϵ^{AB} is symmetric on A and B ; this spinor may be re-expressed in terms of E_k and B_k , on making use of the symmetry of $n_B^{B'} e^{BA'k}$ on its free spinor indices $B'A'$ [9]. Here, we define

$$e^{BA'k} = h^{k\ell} e^{BA'}_\ell , \quad (6.15)$$

where $h^{k\ell}$ is the inverse spatial metric. The above symmetry property then reads

$$n_B^{B'} e^{BA'k} = n_B^{A'} e^{BB'k} . \quad (6.16)$$

From Eq.(6.17), we find the decomposition

$$\Psi_\epsilon^{AB} = n_{B'}^B e^{AB'k} \left((\epsilon - 1) E_k - i (\epsilon + 1) B_k \right) . \quad (6.17)$$

In particular, our boundary condition in Secs.4,5, where the magnetic field (a spatial co-vector field) is fixed on each of the initial and final space-like hypersurfaces Σ_I and Σ_F , is equivalent to fixing the spinorial quantity

$$\Psi_+^{AB} = -2i n_{B'}^B e^{AB'k} B_k \quad (6.18)$$

on each boundary. Note that, even though we regard B_k as having 3 real components, the left-hand side of Eq.(6.19), being symmetric on (AB) , appears to have 3 complex components. In fact, Ψ_+^{AB} , as defined through Eq.(6.18), obeys a further hermiticity requirement, appropriate for spinors in 3 Riemannian dimensions (that is, on the hypersurfaces Σ_I and Σ_F) [9,17,18], so re-balancing matters.

For comparison with much of the work done on black holes and their perturbations, one needs the Newman-Penrose formalism – an essentially spinorial description of the geometry [41]. Here, at present considering only unprimed spinors, a pair (o^A, ι^A) at a point is said to be a normalised dyad if it gives a basis for the 2-complex-dimensional vector space of spinors ω^A at that point, and is normalised according to

$$o_A \iota^A = 1 = -\iota_A o^A . \quad (6.19)$$

The unprimed field strength $\phi_{AB} = \phi_{(AB)}$ can be projected onto the dyad, to give the 3 Newman-Penrose quantities

$$\phi_0 = \phi_{AB} o^A o^B, \quad \phi_1 = \frac{1}{2} \phi_{AB} o^A \iota^B, \quad \phi_2 = \phi_{AB} \iota^A \iota^B. \quad (6.20)$$

each of which is a complex scalar field (function). Using the Newman-Penrose formalism to describe perturbations in the background of a rotating Kerr black-hole geometry, Teukolsky [23] derived separable equations for the quantities ϕ_0 ($s = 1$) and $r^2 \phi_2$ ($s = -1$) (for further review, see [24,42].) In our non-rotating case, with spherically-symmetric background, the Newman-Penrose quantity of most interest to us, following the work of this paper, is ϕ_1 . In the language of [41], ϕ_1 has spin and conformal weight zero. Its properties are best described in the Kinnersley null tetrad for the Schwarzschild or Kerr geometry, in our coordinate system [43]. Here, knowledge of a null tetrad [41] $\ell^\mu, n^\mu, m^\mu, \bar{m}^\mu$ of vectors at a point is equivalent to knowledge of the corresponding normalised spinor dyad (o^A, ι^A) , through the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \ell^\mu &\leftrightarrow o^A o^{A'}, & n^\mu &\leftrightarrow \iota^A \iota^{A'}, \\ m^\mu &\leftrightarrow o^A \iota^{A'}, & \bar{m}^\mu &\leftrightarrow \iota^A o^{A'}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

Contact between this spinorial Newman-Penrose description of (spin-1) Maxwell perturbations, and the decomposition of the linearised Maxwell field strength $F_{\mu\nu}^{(1)}$ given in Secs.3-5 is through the relations

$$\phi_1 = \frac{1}{2r^2} \sum_{\ell m} \left(\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)} + i \psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)} \right) Y_{\ell m}(\Omega). \quad (6.22)$$

Thus, $r^2 \phi_1$ obeys the wave equation (4.16). (Note that, in the language of Geroch, Held and Penrose [44], ϕ_1 has conformal weight zero.) With regard to the boundary conditions on Σ_I and Σ_F , when the variables $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)}$ and $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$ are being used, the correct boundary data (Sec.5) involve specifying $\psi_{1\ell m}^{(o)}$ and $(\partial_t \psi_{1\ell m}^{(e)})$ on Σ_I and Σ_F .

As mentioned above for spin-2 gravitational perturbations, a spinorial version of the 'magnetic' boundary conditions is summarised in [14], in a form which makes it easier to see the unifying features of the system of different spins.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have generalised the scalar (spin-0) calculations of [4,5], to include the more complicated Maxwell (spin-1) case. For spin-1, the linearised Maxwell field splits into a part with even parity and a part with odd parity; a different treatment is needed for each of these two cases. In both cases, the relevant boundary conditions involve fixing the magnetic field on the initial

space-like boundary Σ_I and final boundary Σ_F . The main result is an explicit expression (5.19) for the classical (linearised) Maxwell action, as a functional of the final magnetic field, subject to the simplifying assumption that the magnetic field on the initial surface Σ_I is zero. From this, the Lorentzian quantum amplitude for photon final data can be derived, as in [5] for spin-0 perturbative final data, by taking the limit $\theta \rightarrow 0_+$ of $\exp(iS_{\text{class}})$, where S_{class} is the action of the classical solution of the boundary-value problem with prescribed initial and final data, and with complexified time-interval $T = |T|\exp(-i\theta)$, where $0 < \theta \leq \pi/2$. Corresponding results for graviton (spin-2) final data are summarised in [14].

References

- [1] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, Phys Lett. B **601**, 184 (2004).
- [2] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, Phys Lett. B **613**, 181 (2005).
- [3] A.N.St.J.Farley, 'Quantum Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation, approved 2002 (unpublished).
- [4] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Quantum Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation: I. Complex Approach', submitted for publication (2005).
- [5] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Quantum Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation: II. Spin-0 Amplitude', submitted for publication (2005).
- [6] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Bogoliubov Transformations in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [7] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Vaidya Space-Time in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [8] R.P.Feynman and A.R.Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals*, (McGraw-Hill, New York) (1965).
- [9] P.D.D'Eath, *Supersymmetric Quantum Cosmology*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1996).
- [10] P.R.Garabedian, *Partial Differential Equations*, (Wiley, New York) (1964).
- [11] W.McLean, *Strongly Elliptic Systems and Boundary Integral Equations*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (2000); O.Reula, 'A configuration space for quantum gravity and solutions to the Euclidean Einstein equations in a slab region', Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, **MPA**, 275 (1987).
- [12] P.D.D'Eath, 'Loop amplitudes in supergravity by canonical quantization', in *Fundamental Problems in Classical, Quantum and String Gravity*, ed. N. Sánchez (Observatoire de Paris) **166** (1999), hep-th/9807028.
- [13] T.Regge and J.A.Wheeler, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1063 (1957).
- [14] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Spin-1 and Spin-2 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [15] P.D.D'Eath, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 1387 (1975).
- [16] K.S.Thorne, R.H.Price and D.A.Macdonald, *Black holes. The membrane paradigm*. (Yale University Press, New Haven, Ct.) (1986).
- [17] R.Penrose and W.Rindler, *Spinors and Space-Time*, vol. 1 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1984).

- [18] R.Penrose and W.Rindler, *Spinors and Space-Time*, vol. 2 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1986).
- [19] J.Wess and J.Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, 2nd. edition, (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.) (1992).
- [20] P.Breitenlohner and D.Z.Freedman, Phys. Lett. B **115**, 197 (1982).
- [21] P.Breitenlohner and D.Z.Freedman, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **144**, 249 (1982).
- [22] S.W.Hawking, Phys. Lett. B **126**, 175 (1983).
- [23] S.A.Teukolsky, Astrophys. J. **185**, 635 (1973).
- [24] J.A.H.Futterman, F.A.Handler and R.A.Matzner, *Scattering from Black Holes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1988).
- [25] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Spin-1/2 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', submitted for publication (2005).
- [26] A.N.St.J.Farley and P.D.D'Eath, 'Spin-3/2 Amplitudes in Black-Hole Evaporation', in progress.
- [27] S.W.Hawking and G.F.R.Ellis, *The large scale structure of space-time*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1973).
- [28] T.Eguchi, P.B.Gilkey and A.J.Hanson, Phys. Rep. **66**, 214 (1980).
- [29] R.S.Ward and R.O.Wells, *Twistor Geometry and Field Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) (1990).
- [30] M.Nakahara, *Geometry, Topology and Physics*, 2nd. edition (Institute of Physics, Bristol) (2003).
- [31] C.W.Misner, K.S.Thorne and J.A.Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (Freeman, San Francisco) (1973).
- [32] J.A.Wheeler, 'Geometrodynamics and the Issue of the Final State', p. 317, in *Relativity, Groups and Topology*, eds. C.DeWitt and B.DeWitt (Blackie and Son, London) (1964).
- [33] J.A.Wheeler, 'Superspace and the Nature of Quantum Geometrodynamics', p.242, in *Battelle Rencontres*, eds. C.M.DeWitt and J.A.Wheeler (Benjamin, New York) (1968).
- [34] J.Mathews, J. Soc. Ind. Appl. Math. **10**, 768 (1962).
- [35] J.N.Goldberg, A.J.MacFarlane, E.T.Newman, F.Rohrlich and E.C.G.Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **8**, 2155 (1967).
- [36] F.J.Zerilli, Phys. Rev. D **2**, 2141 (1970).
- [37] J.D.Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, (Wiley, New York) (1975).
- [38] C.T.Cunningham, R.H.Price and V.Moncrief, Astrophys. J. **224**, 643 (1978); *ibid.* **230**, 870 (1979).
- [39] J.A.Wheeler, *Geometrodynamics* (Academic Press, New York) (1962).
- [40] M.Abramowitz and I.A.Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions*, (Dover, New York) (1964).
- [41] E.T.Newman and R.Penrose, J. Math. Phys. **3**, 566 (1962).
- [42] S.Chandrasekhar, *The Mathematical Theory of Black Holes* (Oxford University Press, Oxford) (1992).
- [43] W.Kinnersley, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 1195 (1969).
- [44] R.Geroch, A.Held and R.Penrose, J. Math. Phys. **14**, 874 (1973).